

Appn. Number 10/712,281 (Ibara, et al) GAU 3632 Amnt., Rule 116 contd. 5 of 6

**REMARKS—General**

By the above amendment, applicants have modified independent claims 1 and 11 to more distinctly define the invention patentably over the prior art.

These changes were not made previously because neither the First Office Action nor the Final Office Action remarked on applicants' claim language. However, during a telephone conversation with the Examiner on December 16, 2004, the Examiner stated that the term "enable" was not sufficient, and that "more structurally-based" language was preferred. Applicants submit the present amendment in compliance with this guideline set forth by the Examiner during that discussion, and respectfully request that the case be so amended to place it in condition for allowance.

As to the rejections stated in the First and Final Office Actions, applicants previously addressed these by the response faxed October 20, 2004. For ease of reference, that response was organized as follows:


Pages 6-9: The use of applicants' claims to define the reference refuted (emphasizing novelty).

Pages 9-11: Unobviousness over the reference demonstrated.

Pages 11-22: Application of combined references refuted.

Page 22: Request for constructive assistance pursuant to M.P.E.P. § 2173.02 and § 707.07(j).

Very respectfully,

  
Steven Ibara

  
Crystal Steinke

  
Joel Jones

  
Vicky Greenbaum

  
Woodley Packard

  
Elisa Jones

Applicants Pro Se